



Docket No.: 218129US90

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

NORMAN F. OBLON
(703) 413-3000
NOBLON@OBLON.COM

ROBERT T. POUS
(703) 413-3000
RPOUS@OBLON.COM

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/067,901

Applicants: Takatoshi NISHIZAWA, et al.

Filing Date: February 8, 2002

For: STRETCHED FILM OF VOID-CONTAINING
THERMOPLASTIC RESIN AND PROCESS FOR
PRODUCING THE SAME

Group Art Unit: 1771

Examiner: VO, H.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESTRICTION RESPONSE

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850


(703) 413-3000 (phone)

(703) 413-2220 (fax)

I:\cfdav\electionsandrestrictions\218129.restriction

Robert T. Pous

Registration No. 29,099



DOCKET NO: 218129US90

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

:

TAKATOSHI NISHIZAWA, ET AL.

: EXAMINER: VO, H.

SERIAL NO: 10/067,901

:

FILED: FEBRUARY 8, 2002

: GROUP ART UNIT: 1771

FOR: STRETCHED FILM OF VOID-
CONTAINING THERMOPLASTIC RESIN
AND PROCESS FOR PRODUCING THE
SAME

:

RESTRICTION RESPONSE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Office Action dated July 26, 2004, Applicants herein elects group I corresponding to claims 1-11, drawn to a stretched film, classified in class 428, subclass 317.9, **with traverse** for prosecution in the present application.

Applicants traverse the outstanding Restriction Requirement as the outstanding Restriction Requirement has not established that an undue burden would be required if the Restriction Requirement was not issued and if all the claims were examined together. More particularly, MPEP §803 states:


If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

Application No. 10/067,901
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2004

In the present application any search of the elected claims would also include the classes and subclasses appropriate for searching the non-elected claims, and so then would be no undue burden if all of the claims were examined together.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Robert T. Pous
Registration No. 29,099

I:\CFDAV\ELECTIONSANDRESTRICTIONS\218129.RESTRICTION